

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

This paper is presented in response to the final official action dated November 23, 2010, wherein (a) claims 1 and 3-28 were pending, (b) claims 1-5, 7, and 12-14 [sic - claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 12-14] were rejected as being anticipated by Cooper, (c) claims 6 and 8-10 were rejected under as being obvious over Cooper, (d) claim 11 was rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Belvedere, (e) claims 15-18 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Fillebrown, (f) claims 19-21 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of DiRe, and (g) claims 22-28 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of DiRe and Hayduk.

By the foregoing, claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Entry of the foregoing amendments are proper after final rejection and is solicited, as the claim amendments will require no additional consideration and/or search on the part of the Office and place the claims in better form for consideration on appeal.

In view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The anticipation rejections of claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 12-14, all based on Cooper, are respectfully traversed; reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1 and 12 are amended to generally recite that the digital input signal is passed to both a third conversion block and a fourth conversion block. Cooper does not describe an interface unit having a processing unit that includes all four conversion blocks recited in amended claims 1 and 12. In particular, amended claim 1 recites that a first conversion block converts an analog video input signal into a digital input signal and passes the digital input signal to a second conversion block. The second conversion block freezes, mirrors, quads, or deinterlaces the digital input signal and passes the digital input signal to one of a third conversion block or a fourth conversion block. The third conversion block converts the digital input signal to a first PC standard output signal, and the fourth conversion block for converts the digital input signal to a second PC standard output signal.

Instead of the four conversion block recited by amended claims 1 and 12, Cooper describes an interface unit (*i.e.*, a universal docking station or “UDS”) including computer processors for image capture and manipulation (paragraph [0027]) as well as digital to analog and analog to digital conversion (paragraph [0048]). However, the image capture, manipulation, and conversion described by Cooper does not constitute the four specific conversion blocks recited by amended claim 1. In particular, Cooper does not describe analog input that proceeds from the first conversion block to the second conversion block, then to both the third and fourth conversion block, as recited by amended claims 1 and 12.

Because Cooper does not describe the processing unit including four conversion blocks as recited by amended claims 1 and 12, Cooper cannot anticipate amended claims 1 and 12. At least for these reasons, claims 1 and 12 (and claims 3-5 and 7 as well as claims 13-14 respectively depending therefrom) are not anticipated by Cooper, and an indication to that effect is solicited.

III. Rejection of Claims 6, 8-11, and 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The obviousness rejections of claims 6, 8-11, and 15-28, all based on Cooper in various combinations with Belvedere, Fillebrown, Dire, and Hayduk, are respectfully traversed; reconsideration is requested.

Each of claims 6, 8-11, and 15-28 depends from claim 1 or 12, respectively. For the reasons discussed above, claims 1 and 12 are not anticipated by Cooper. None of Belvedere, Fillebrown, Dire, and Hayduk teach or suggest the elements of amended claims 1 and 12 that are missing from Cooper’s disclosure, nor are they cited for such teaching or suggestion. Therefore, because the applied art does not show or suggest all the limitations of claims 6, 8-11, and 15-28, these claims are not obvious and an indication to that effect is solicited.

IV. Conclusion

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all claims 1 and 3-28 are solicited.

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application toward allowance, he is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

January 21, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew R. Smith

Registration No.: 62,162
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 South Wacker Drive
6300 Willis Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant